

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, the arguments against the punitive anti-India amendment are stronger this year than they have ever been. In March, President Clinton completed the first visit to India by an American President in more than 20 years. The President's trip accompanied by a bipartisan congressional delegation produced a range of agreements on trade and investments, security partnerships and cooperation on energy and the environment. In September, India's democratically elected prime minister will be visiting the U.S. to further build upon this progress, especially in the area of economic relations.

India is the world's largest democracy. It is a country that has made tremendous progress in free market economic reforms over the past decade. But more to the point, since the gentleman from Indiana has been critical of India's human rights records, India's Human Rights Commission has been praised by our State Department and many international agencies for its independence and effectiveness. Indeed, India has become a model for the rest of Asia and the rest of the developing world in terms of democratization, economic reform and human rights.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, cutting aid to India only serves to hamper America's efforts to reduce poverty, eradicate disease and promote broad-based economic growth in the world's second most populous Nation. This amendment never made any sense, and it certainly makes less sense now.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it is in America's national interests to support and sustain India's development. The Commerce Department identifies India as one of the 10 Big Emerging Markets. With a growing high-tech industry, combined with the support and confidence of American investment, India has positioned itself to be one of the great success stories of the 21st century.

India has made tremendous progress in addressing human rights issues. The State Department has praised India for its substantial progress in the area of human rights. It is a strong, vibrant democracy that features an independent judiciary, diverse political parties and a free press, which vigorously assists in the investigation of human rights abuses.

This amendment threatens the relationship between the United States and the Republic of India. We should not be punishing countries like India, an example of freedom and democracy in Asia, while rewarding authoritarian governments like China which supports forced labor, which opposes freedom of the press, which opposes freedom of religion.

Mr. Chairman, the Burton amendment is a step in the wrong direction for American foreign policy. We should oppose it.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, because I believe that we want peace in India and Pakistan, and my visit with the President in those countries, I ask that we oppose this amendment so that peace can be had in those nations.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, it never ceases to amaze me that we come out here on this Burton amendment again. It is going to lose. But I implore my colleagues to look seriously and objectively at India. The proponents of this amendment say that India suppresses and violently intimidates its religious minorities. To use a Hindi word, that is *bakwaas*; that is absolute nonsense. The Indians know they have a problem, but they are the most secular country in the world. They appointed a Supreme Court inquiry, only the second time in their history, to look at the death of an American missionary. They also have a separate Human Rights Commission that operates in this country.

In contrast, consider our own treatment of Arab Americans in this country. When they are portrayed as terrorists, we turn a blind eye. India recognizes their problem and deals with them. I believe that India has problems, but it is a nation that is dealing with them. Rather than debate these kinds of amendments, we ought to find ways to work cooperatively with India to support their development.

Vote against the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, here we are discussing the Burton amendment yet again. It never passes, and as far as I can tell, is brought up just to be inflammatory.

I implore my colleagues to look at the nation of India objectively. Since Independence, India has been a thriving democracy where suffrage is universal and voting rates are higher than the United States.

Unlike most former colonial nations, India has never suffered under a military dictator. The United States Military has more influence and participation in our government than the Indian Military has in theirs. India is a stable democracy, arguably the strongest and most stable in all of Asia.

Proponents of this amendment say that India suppresses and violently intimidates its religious minorities. That is *bakwaas*—pure nonsense. India is one of the most secular states in the world. India recognizes and guarantees religious freedoms and has the commitment to the rule of law to enforce those guarantees.

There have been isolated incidents—anomalies really—that have made the worldwide news, however, India has publicly, officially,

and resoundingly responded. India appointed a Supreme Court inquiry, for only the second time in this country's history, to investigate an instance of a Christian missionary's death. Also, India has a separate Human Rights Commission that is active and highly independent.

What is our response in this country when American-Muslims are depicted vilely as terrorists? We blindly turn away. India admits these problems and addresses them in the courts as well as and in the open and totally free press.

India has its problems, but it is a nation dealing with those problems. Rather than debate amendments that divide the US and India, we ought to work with India help come to grips with their problems and be a partner in the development of technology, trade and culture. The US and India have much in common and the potential to be great partners, we must not cut India off.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Burton amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to my good friend from Indiana's amendment. While I commend my colleague's sincere concern about human rights and his tireless work on behalf of the oppressed, I have to disagree with him about his assessment regarding India. India has a fiercely democratic system that protects and promotes religious freedom and an independent judicial system.

We must not forget that the tensions between the people of India and Pakistan are to a very large degree fueled by communist China. Beijing's mischief making in Burma, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and occupied Tibet, nations that surround India, is a dangerous attempt to keep democratic India off balance. China has sold over \$2 billion in arms to the drug dealing Burmese junta. It has given or sold nuclear and conventional weapons to Pakistan. China occupies Tibet on India's northern border and Beijing is Sri Lanka's major supplier of arms.

India faces a difficult challenge in fighting extremists. The same vicious terrorists who attack innocent Indians are also responsible for the deaths of many innocent Americans. And our requests to the Pakistani government to pressure their Taliban clients to turn over the Saudi terrorist Osama bin Ladin to American law officers has fallen on deaf ears.

I regrettably, oppose my good friend's amendment. We need to work closer with democratic India to promote our similar concerns throughout the region. However, this is a wrong amendment targeted at the wrong country.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote against the resolution.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California for her excellent work on this and so many other issues.